



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/523,903	08/19/2005	Danny Louis Cornelius Morlion	003D.0049.U1(US)	7558

29683 7590 02/20/2007
HARRINGTON & SMITH, PC
4 RESEARCH DRIVE
SHELTON, CT 06484-6212

EXAMINER

ABRAMS, NEIL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2839

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/20/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/523,903	MORLION	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Neil Abrams	2839	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 October 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 8-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Abstract suggest deletion of last sentence and addition of - - The second part may include an active electronic circuit (7) for manipulating signals and that is to receive power from the first part through the power supply line. The same first part may also be used with a different second part (figure 3) that does include the active electronic circuit but instead includes a capacitor to terminable the power supply line - -. Wording may be changed as considered proper by applicant.

1. Claims 8, 9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Larabell.
2. For claim 8, Larabell, figures 3, 4, 5, system includes a first connector part at host 70, a second connector part, figs 3,4 at 8 (see col 4, line 31) , 10, 13 to be connected to the first part, either through cable 64 or directly, the first connector used to supply power to operate an electronic circuit 20, 30 (bus regenerator) in the second part, see column 5, lines 12-25, note terms "from an external device (usually the host device)" and column 6, lines 23-32. Note discussion of power line 40, numeral not in figures, but should be the figure 4, line under box 50. This rejection also applies to claims 9, 12.
3. As alternative, should issues arise as Larabell recited features may also be considered as obvious variations. For example, Larabell does not refer to contacts in the connectors or use term "active" for 20,30 however these are deemed as inherent or obvious matters that should not be at issue . For claim 9, term, "ground" does not define over Larabell since a contact if used for power is not a ground contact.

4. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larabell in view of Naito and Bassler.

5. Larabell lacks "clearly shown" contacts. Naito and Bassler show "contacts". Obvious to include such contacts in Larabell as necessary for current transmission. Term "ground" does not avoid rejection for reason noted above.

6. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larabell in view of Boutros.

7. Larabell lacks equalization device. Boutros show such circuit at 28. Obvious to use same in Larabell to issue accuracy of signal transmission.

8. Claims 10, 13, 14, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larabell in view of Bassler

9. Larabell lacks a connector mount pcb. Bassler at 102 uses such a pcb. Obvious to use same in Larabell host 70 to mount the connector as a standard feature of electronic apparatus.

10. Applicant's arguments filed with the amendment have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The argument on page 7; lines 21-27 is not persuasive and does not seem directed to Larabell applied as a primary reference. The dependent claim features and the claim 15 "printed circuit board" use do not seem separately at issue.

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2839

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Neil Abrams at telephone number 571-272-2089


NEIL ABRAMS
PRIMARY EXAMINER